

any confusion that the applicant is not claiming another 'first and second position'.

The Applicants amended independent Claim 1 to recite the limitations of original Claim 2 and for clarity. Therefore, independent Claim 1, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

As to Claim 15, the Examiner stated:

Claim 15 recites the limitation 'a latch'. It is unclear if applicant is claiming another latch or referring to the prior claimed latch.

Claim 15 is a dependent claim. Claim 15 depends from Claim 14, which depends from Claim 13, which depends from Claim 12, which depends from Claim 6, which depends from independent Claim 1. In the claims, "a latch" is first recited in Claim 15 there does not appear to be a prior claimed latch as the Examiner stated. Claim 15 has however further been amended for clarity. Therefore, dependent Claim 15, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

As to Claims 20 and 41, the Examiner stated:

Claims 20 and 41 recite the limitation 'the first lock member'. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claims 20 and 41, as amended, now recite "the base lock member," for clarity. Therefore, Claims 20 and 41, as amended, comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

As to Claim 22, the Examiner stated:

Claim 22 recites the limitation 'the secondary lock member'. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22, as amended, now recites "the at least one secondary lock member" instead of "the secondary lock member," for clarity. Therefore, Claim 22, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

As to Claim 26, the Examiner stated:

Claim 26 recites the limitation 'a activation device'. Applicant should rewrite the claim to read 'the activation device'.

The Applicants have amended Claim 26 according to the Examiner's suggestion to recite "the activation device," for clarity. Therefore, Claim 26, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

As to Claim 36, the Examiner stated:

Claim 36 recites the limitation 'the orientation of the latch may be reversed.' The use of the term 'may be' is indefinite since it does not set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired.

The Applicants have amended Claim 36 to remove the language "may be reversed" and to include the language "is selectively reversible." Therefore, the new language, included for clarity, renders Claim 36 in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

As to Claims 49, 63, 81, 85, 90, and 91, the Examiner stated:

Claims 49, 63, 81, 85, 90, and 91 recite 'shaped to be inserted'. This limitation is indefinite and unclear.

There is an inconsistency between the language in the preamble and certain portions in the body of the claim, thereby making the scope of the claim unclear. The preamble in claims 63, 81, 85 and 90 clearly indicates that a subcombination is being claimed, e.g., 'a lock assembly for securing a door...' This language would lead the examiner to believe that the applicant intends to claim only the subcombination of 'a lock assembly,' the door being only functionally recited. This presents no problem as long as the body of the claim also refers to the door functionally, such as, 'for attachment to said door.'

The problem arises when the door is positively recited within the body of the claim, such as, 'the latch aperture being located along the first edge of the door.' There is an inconsistency within the claim; the preamble indicates subcombination, while in at least one instance in the body of the claim there is a positive recital of structure indicating that the combination of a lock assembly and a door is being claimed. The examiner cannot be sure if applicant's intent is to claim merely the lock assembly or the lock assembly in combination with the door.

Applicant is required to clarify what the claims are intended to be drawn to, i.e., either the lock assembly alone or the

combination of the lock assembly and the door. Applicant should make the language of the claim consistent with applicant's intent. In formulating a rejection on the merits, the examiner is considering that the claims are drawn to the combination and the claims will be rejected accordingly. If applicant indicates by amendment that the combination claim is the intention, the language in the preamble should be consistent with the language in the body of the claims. If the intent is to claim the subcombination, then the body of the claims must be amended to remove positive recitation of the combination.

The Applicants have amended independent Claim 49, for clarity. Therefore, independent Claim 49 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2.

The Applicants have amended Claims 63, 67, 68, 69, 79 and 80 for clarity, to recite the subcombination of a lock assembly. Therefore, independent Claim 63 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

The Applicants have amended Claim 81 for clarity. The Applicants intended to claim the subcombination of a lock assembly. Therefore, independent Claim 81, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

The Applicants have amended Claim 85 for clarity, to recite the subcombination of a lock assembly. Therefore, independent Claim 85, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

The Applicants have amended Claim 90 for clarity to recite the subcombination of a lock assembly. Therefore, independent Claim 90, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

The Applicants have amended Claim 91 for clarity to recite the subcombination of a lock assembly. Therefore, independent Claim 91, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. Re. 26,677 ("Russell et al. '677").



The Examiner stated that "Russell et al. '677 teaches a base lock member (16); a first input device (49); and an activation device (20)."

The Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to include the limitation recited in original dependent Claim 2. Therefore, Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Russell et al. '677.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2-6, 12-35, 37-49, 51-53, 55-68, 70, 72-78, 81-86 and 90-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell et al. '677 as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,498,038 to ("Simon et al. '038").

The Examiner stated:

Russell et al. '677 teaches a housing (11); a latch (18); a second input device (85) provides a positive indication to an operator; said first input device is a thumbturn (49); said second input device is a handle (85); said activation device is a button (20); said first input device is a handle (49); the activation device is removable (with proper tools is removable); the second input device is prevent from rotation in one direction (column 4, lines 12-15); a motion reversing mechanism (105); a deadbolt aperture (figure 4); a drive (54); and a lock out means (20).

Simon et al. '038 teaches at least one secondary locking member (figure 11; 223 (top)); said at least one secondary lock member is an extension bolt (223); a first lock member (figure 11; 223 (bottom)); a first extension member base (figure 11, top of 110); a second extension member base (figure 11, bottom of 110); a first extension member aperture (229); a second extension aperture (22()); a first extension member (221); a second extension member (figure 11, 221); a first edge plate (figure 11, plate for 223); a second edge plate (figure 11, plate for 223).

As concerns the limitations of the second input device must be rotated less than forty five degrees and wherein the at least one second lock

member and the first lock member each move linearly at least one inch, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide these modifications, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

As concerns the limitations of said at least one secondary lock member is a deadbolt, the base lock member is a hook member and the at least one secondary lock member is a hook member is seen as an obvious design choice. It is well known in the art to use either a deadbolt or a hood member for bolting.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the latch arrangement of Russell et al. '677 with secondary lock members, as taught by Simon et al. '038, in order to provide auxiliary locking members to enhance security.

Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1, as amended (amended independent Claim 1 recites substantially the same limitation as original dependent Claim 2), recites "the base lock member is **prevented** from moving from the first position to the second position when the activation device is not activated" (emphasis added). Further, independent Claim 1, as amended, recites "at least one secondary lock member having a first position and a second position."

Russell et al. '677 discloses an auxiliary bolt 20 that acts as a deadbolt lock out such that when auxiliary bolt 20 is depressed door 24 being in a closed position, deadbolt 16 can be extended. Simon et al. '038 discloses a multi-point door lock system that includes a jamb bolt 450 and shoot bolts 221 and 171. Russell et al. '677 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of auxiliary bolt 20 with a multi-point door lock system. Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of an auxiliary bolt to prevent the extension of jamb bolt 450.

A

Further, Russell et al. '677 does not provide any motivation to combine the auxiliary bolt of Russell et al. '677 with the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038. Neither does Simon et al. '038 provide motivation to combine the teachings of Russell et al. '677 with the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038.

"Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability - the essence of hindsight." In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With regard to independent Claim 1, neither Russell et al. '677, nor Simon et al. '038, alone, or in any proper combination, teaches, or suggests the desirability of having a "base lock member [that] is prevented from moving from the first position to the second position when the activation device is not activated" and further having "at least one secondary lock member having a first secondary lock position and a second secondary lock position." Further, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 provide motivation to combine the teachings of Russell et al. '677 and Simon et al. '038.

Therefore, independent Claim 1 and its dependents are not obvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 28

With regard to independent Claim 28, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 teach, disclose, or suggest, either alone, or in combination, a locking system wherein "the movement of the base lock member, to the fully locked position, is selectively and sequentially independent of the movement of the at least one secondary lock member to the fully locked position."

Russell et al. '677 does not disclose a locking system which includes a base lock member and at least one secondary lock member. Simon et al. '038, which discloses a multi-point door lock system, includes both a jamb bolt and shoot bolts, however, Simon et al. '038 teaches a multi-point door lock system in which the sequence of the

A

locks may be carried out in only one sequence. The Examiner's attention is directed to column 2, lines 4-8 of Simon et al. '038, which states "[t]hus, the lock is 'self-teaching' in that one unfamiliar with the operation of the lock can quickly determine the sequence in which the lock operates because it operates in only one sequence." Further, the Examiner's attention is directed to column 8, lines 22-28 of Simon et al. '038, which states "the multi-point door latch system is 'self-teaching' in that it forces the user to operate it in a predefined and mechanically constrained sequence which cannot be easily defeated. It can thus be seen that the entire closing and locking sequence of the inactive and active doors is fully defined by the mechanical constraints described."

Therefore, Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest, the subject matter recited in Claim 28, and teaches away from a locking system wherein the movement of the base lock member is "selectively and sequentially independent of the movement of the at least one secondary lock member." The asserted advantage of the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038 is that the lock operates in only one sequence. Further, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 disclose, teach, or suggest, alone, or in combination, a selectively and sequentially independent locking system. Thus, independent Claim 28 and its dependents are nonobvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 49

With regard to independent Claim 49, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 teach, disclose, or suggest, either alone, or in any proper combination, a locking system wherein the activation device "allows selective actuation of the first lock member independent of the at least one second lock member." Therefore, as explained with respect to independent Claim 28 Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in Claim 49, in particular, "a door lock assembly" having

An activation device that allows selective actuation of one of the first lock member independent of the at least one second lock member, and the at least one second lock member and the

first lock member are actuatable independent of each other, when the activation device is activated.

The asserted advantage of the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038 is that the lock operates in only one sequence. Thus, the movement of one locking member of Simon et al. '038 is dependent on movement of another locking member. Further, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 disclose, teach, or suggest, alone, or in any proper combination, an independent locking system, as recited in Claim 49. Thus, independent Claim 49 and its dependents are nonobvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 63

With regard to independent Claim 63, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 discloses, teaches, or suggests,

An activation device that allows one of selective actuation of the deadbolt **independent** of the first and second lock members, the first and second lock members and the deadbolt being actuatable **independent** of each other, and the first and second lock member and the deadbolt being actuatable dependent with each other, when the activation device is activated.

Although Russell et al. '677 discloses an auxiliary bolt, that prevents the movement of the deadbolt when the auxiliary bolt is extended, and Simon et al. '038 discloses a multi-point door lock system in which the lock operates in only one sequence, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 discloses, teaches, or suggests, alone or in any proper combination, an activation device that allows "selective actuation of the deadbolt independent of the first and second lock members." As discussed above with respect to independent Claims 28 and 49, Simon et al. '038 teaches only a lock that operates in only one sequence.

Further, Russell et al. '677 teaches only an activation bolt. Also, Russell et al. '677 and Simon et al. '038 do not disclose, teach, or suggest, alone or in any proper combination, an activation device that allows actuation of the first and second lock

A

members and "the deadbolt independent of the first and second lock members...when the activation device is activated". As stated above, Simon et al. '038 teaches only a lock that operates in only one sequence. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974).

Further still, Russell et al. '677 and Simon et al. '038 do not disclose, teach, or suggest, alone, or in any proper combination, an activation device that allows actuation of first and second lock members and "the deadbolt being actuatable dependent with each other, when the activation device is activated". Russell et al. '677 discloses an auxiliary bolt 20 that acts as a deadbolt lock out such that when auxiliary bolt 20 is depressed by door 24 being in a closed position, deadbolt 16 can be extended. Simon et al. '038 discloses a multi-point door lock system that includes a jamb bolt 450 and shoot bolts 221 and 171. Russell et al. '677 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of auxiliary bolt 20 with a multi-point door lock system. Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of an auxiliary bolt to prevent the extension of jamb bolt 450. Also, Russell et al. '677 does not provide any motivation to combine the auxiliary bolt of Russell et al. '677 with the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038. Neither does Simon et al. '038 provide motivation to combine the teachings of Russell et al. '677 with the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038.

"Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability - the essence of hindsight." In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). With regard to independent Claim 63, neither Russell et al. '677, nor Simon et al. '038, alone, or in combination suggests the desirability of having an activation device that prevents movement of both the deadbolt and the first and second lock members when the activation device is not activated.

Therefore, independent Claim 63 and its dependents are nonobvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 81

With regard to independent Claim 81, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 teach, disclose, or suggest, alone, or in any proper combination, a locking system wherein "the deadbolt and the at least one lock member may be selectively extended independently of one another." Therefore, as explained with regard to independent Claim 26, Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in Claim 81. The asserted advantage of the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038 is that the lock operates in only one sequence. Further, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 disclose, teach, or suggest, alone, or in any proper combination, a selectively independent locking system. Thus, independent Claim 81 and its dependents are nonobvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 85

With regard to independent Claim 85, which has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claim 86, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 teach, disclose, or suggest, either alone, or in combination, "an activation device, that allows actuation of the deadbolt when the activation device is activated, wherein substantial movement of the second input device is prevented when the deadbolt is substantially extended." Russell et al. '677 does not disclose a locking system which includes a first and second input device in which substantial movement of the second input device is prevented when the deadbolt is substantially extended. Simon et al. '038, which discloses a multi-point door lock system, does not disclose, teach, or suggest two input devices such that substantial movement of the second input device is prevented when the deadbolt is substantially extended. To establish the *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 discloses, teaches, or suggests, alone or in any proper combination, a first and second input device such that substantial movement of the second input device is prevented when the deadbolt is

A

substantially extended. Thus, independent Claim 85 is not obvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 90

With regard to independent Claim 90, neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 teach, disclose, or suggest, either alone, or in combination, "an activation device that allows one of selective actuation of the deadbolt independent of the at least one secondary lock member, the at least one secondary lock member and the deadbolt being actuatable independent of each other, when the activation device is depressed." Therefore, as explained with regard to independent Claims 26 and 49, Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in Claim 90. The asserted advantage of the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038 is that the lock operates in only one sequence. Further, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 discloses, teaches, or suggests, alone, or in combination, an independent locking system. Thus, independent Claim 90 is nonobvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 91

With regard to independent Claim 91, independent Claim 91 is directed to a door lock assembly for securing a door in a door frame. The door lock assembly includes "a lock out means that prevents actuation of one of the first lock member independent of the second lock member, and the first lock member and the second lock member independent of each other, when the lock out means is not activated." Therefore, as explained with regard to independent Claims 26 and 49, Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in independent Claim 91. The asserted advantage of the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038 is that the lock operates in only one sequence. Further, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 discloses, teaches, or suggests, alone, or in any proper

A

combination, an independent locking system. Thus, independent Claim 91 is nonobvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Independent Claim 92

With regard to independent Claim 92, independent Claim 92 is directed to a locking system. The locking system has a base lock member that is "selectively and sequentially independent of movement of the at least one secondary lock member and the at least one secondary lock member is prevented from substantial movement when the base lock member and the at least one secondary lock member are in their locked positions." As explained with regard to independent Claims 26 and 49, Simon et al. '038 does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in independent Claim 92. The asserted advantage of the multi-point door lock system of Simon et al. '038 is that the lock operates in only one sequence. Further, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Neither Russell et al. '677 nor Simon et al. '038 disclose, teach, or suggest, alone, or in any proper combination, an independent locking system. Thus, independent Claim 92 is nonobvious over Russell et al. '677 in view of Simon et al. '038.

Dependent Claims 36, 50, 54, 69, and 71

In Section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 36, 50, 54, 69 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Re. 26,677 to Russell et al. '677 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,498,038 to Simon et al. '038 as applied above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,671,549 to Marotto et al. The Examiner stated that:

Marotto et al. '549 teaches the orientation of a latch that is adapted to be reversed (abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the latch of Russell et al. '677 as modified for use on either right or left handed doors as taught by, Marotto et al. '549, in order to provide a latch arrangement that is more versatile.

Applicants respectfully submit that given the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that independent Claims 28, 49, and 63, from which Claims

36, 50, 54, 69, and 71 depend, are allowable. Therefore, the Examiner's rejections of Claims 36, 50, 54, 69, and 71 are moot.

Dependent Claim 77

In Section 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Re. 26,677 to Russell et al. '677 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,498,038 to Simon et al. '038 as applied above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,192,097 to Su. The Examiner stated that:

Su '097 teaches a latch is substantially made of a polyester resin (abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the latch of Russell et al. '677 as modified with a plastic latch as taught by Su '097, in order to provide a latch arrangement that is corrosion resistant.

Applicants respectfully submit that given the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that independent Claim 63, from which Claim 77 depends, is allowable. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 77 is moot.

Dependent Claims 7-11, 79, and 80

In Section 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7-11, 79, and 80 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Re. 26,677 to Russell et al. '677 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,498,038 to Simon et al. '038 as applied above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,218,183 to Springer. The Examiner stated that:

Springer '183 teaches a passive lock device including a passive lock member (24) moves in response to the base lock member; a passive input device (73)

A second door including a passive lock (page 2, lines 27-29); and an extension member (26).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify latch of Russell et al. '677 as modified with a passive lock system, as taught by Springer '183, in order to provide a keeper that is more secure



at latching a bolt, hence adding a greater element of security.

Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 63, from which Claims 7-11, 79, and 80 depend, are allowable, given the foregoing amendments and remarks. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of Claims 7-11, 79, and 80 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are moot.

* * * * *

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10-15, 18-27, 36, 41, 48, 49, 61, 63, 67-70, 73, 74, 76, 79-81, 85, 90, and 91 have been amended. Claims 2, 39, 40, and 86 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3-38, 41-85, and 90-92 are now pending in this application.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 04, 2000

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER
Firstar Center
777 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-5367
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603

A